

## **STANDARD V RE-APPROVAL**

In preparation for the OSPI site visit in January, 2009, faculty and staff, PEAB members, field instructors, and alumni reviewed and updated numerous components of our Teacher Certification Program. This process of preparing for the site visit was invaluable in providing all of us an opportunity to re-visit and re-think our entire program, focusing more completely on the new Standard V requirements of specific evidence of student learning impacted by course content, pedagogy, community involvement, and professionalism. During this preparation process, courses were examined and revised to include additional strategies for affecting student learning; conceptual frameworks and standards being covered were added to syllabi; candidates focused more directly on providing concrete evidence of their positive impact on student learning; master teachers and field instructors helped interns base their instruction even more strongly on assessment; final certification portfolios grew to include sections more specifically devoted to this; intentional focus was placed on the roles of parents and community in students' learning; candidates became more aware of the importance of dispositions. This narrative, therefore, offers a strengthened focus on the categories in the latest re-approval template. It describes ways that we have been previously in compliance with the standard, plus our recent efforts to come more closely into compliance, and our plans to align even more directly in the future.

*1. In a narrative of 7-10 pages, describe how your program has changed to meet the requirements of Standard V in the following areas:*

- *Course content*
- *Field experiences*
- *P-12 district/school partnerships*
- *Faculty development*

*In areas where no changes were necessary, briefly indicate why.*

### **COURSE CONTENT**

During the 2008-2009 school year, the faculty revisited its UWB Conceptual Framework in preparation for the OSPI site visit. Individual course assignments were carefully aligned with Standard V and the conceptual framework, and syllabi were revised to reflect this alignment. There has been an ongoing emphasis on candidates' providing solid evidence that they have made a positive impact on their students' learning, and field assignments, lesson plans, field notebooks, and portfolios all address this more specifically than previously.

In preparation for the OSPI site visit, faculty collected and displayed examples of Student-Based Evidence, both in evidence charts within the Program Report and also in the Evidence Room, even though our program was not expected to use the revised form yet. These

examples reflected this increased effort to enable candidates to demonstrate their positive impact on student learning.

In 2006, the Instructional Design and Assessment course was shifted from four to three credits and it was renamed Instructional Design. This was in recognition that assessment is covered in each of the content courses, with methods specific to the discipline. Therefore, faculty teaching these courses have increased their attention on types of assessment appropriate to their area.

Examples of increased attention to the assessment of student learning appear in BEDUC 421: Knowing, Teaching, and Assessing in Physical and Life Sciences and Geography, in BEDUC 435: Student Teaching, and in BEDUC 425: the Professional Seminar. Candidates in BEDUC 421 teach students to record and self-assess their own observations in individual science notebooks. Assignments for the student teaching quarter, including preparation of the professional portfolio, are continually more focused on the importance of providing concrete evidence of student learning. In addition, field instructors and master teachers are notably more skilled in helping candidates to seek and document specific examples of student learning. The Professional Pedagogical Assessment (PPA) provides effective focus on this, and field personnel have come to incorporate more direct instruction in this area in their field seminars, as a result of the K-8 Supervisory Group Colloquium, described below.

More specific examples of this attention to assessment occur in two literacy courses, BEDUC 409 and 410, which continue to evolve to include more emphasis on assessment and its implications for instruction. In the K-8 Teacher Certification Program, the two-quarter literacy methods course sequence addresses the development of instructional strategies in a direct manner by incorporating an in-class practicum into most class sessions. Approximately sixteen of twenty class sessions are now conducted at a nearby elementary school, and a practicum time for teacher candidates to work with students is built into the class schedule. In BEDUC 409, a major course project is the implementation and analysis of the Emergent Literacy Profile (ELP), an individually-administered assessment of emergent literacy skills such as phonemic awareness, book handling and concepts of print, basic phonics knowledge, and emergent writing skills. Each teacher candidate administers the ELP to a kindergarten "buddy" as part of the in-class practicum. This assessment is closely aligned with readings on emergent literacy (Fox, 2008; Teale & Sulzby, 1999) and with in-class discussions and online journal entries exploring these topics. The instructors model how to administer the assessment and interpret the results. Teacher candidates then take the ELP data, design an activity at the appropriate instructional level, and implement the activity with their buddies. They complete the exercise by assessing the effects of their lessons and determining recommendations for future instruction. Candidates turn in a formal write-up of the experience, including a reflection and a summary of ELP findings to be shared with the child's teacher. This project completes the cycle of assessment, instruction, and reflection, and is closely tied to major course concepts.

In BEDUC 410, the process works in a similar fashion, but in terms of an older student and the five elements of reading as identified by the National Reading Panel (2000): phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, comprehension, and vocabulary. Working with students over a series of informal reading conferences, teacher candidates gather assessment data on each of these areas. Teacher candidates, with guidance, use conference data to design and implement a lesson based on the needs of their buddies. This project also concludes with a formal write-up and reflection, again reinforcing the cycle of assessment, instruction, and reflection at the level of the individual learner.

Instruction and assessment in writing is also a part of the two-quarter literacy series, as candidates experience assessing children's literacy development with their elementary school buddies. In BEDUC 409 candidates assess kindergarten "buddies" on-site at the elementary school. Using a modified "Early Literacy Profile" (used by permission from Houghton Mifflin), K-8 candidates assess kindergartners' phonemic and phonological awareness, concepts about print, comprehension, emergent writing ability and alphabetic knowledge. They then develop lessons specifically based on their assessment of the students. Because they work with all of the students in a given classroom and utilize both small and large group discussions, candidates have an opportunity to learn about assessing and instructing students across a wide range of abilities, including those children with specific disabilities and those who are new to the English language. BEDUC 409 also provides an opportunity for candidates to use running records and individual reading conferences to assess "just right" text levels for first and second grade children. Both of these experiences are scaffolded through course readings (e.g. Fox, 2008; Routman, 2003; supplemental readings), instructor modeling and feedback, and classroom discussion. These learning experiences are designed to demonstrate to candidates the crucial link between assessment, the development of learning goals, and instruction. Professors want candidates to become "adaptive teachers" (Duffy, 2004), those who can recognize and meet the needs of individual children in a variety of contexts.

BEDUC 410 offers candidates the opportunity to work with a fifth- or sixth-grade buddy over an extended period of six to seven meetings in order to assess literacy development. The focus here is assessment and instruction of five of the essential components of reading ability identified by the National Reading Panel as appropriate for intermediate learners (Phonemic Awareness, Phonics, Vocabulary, Comprehension, Fluency) plus language and writing. Prior to academic year 2007-2008, the Qualitative Reading Inventory (Leslie & Caldwell, 2006) was used as the major text for the assessment of intermediate students' reading ability. As reflected in the course evaluations, the move to teach the course on site at an elementary school and the addition of a regular practicum experience during the class itself, meant that teachers did not have time to appropriately scaffold the administration of the QRI. As a result, candidates' understanding of assessment and instruction issues for intermediate students was hindered. Teachers have since modified this experience so that candidates work with their buddies using structured conferences with specific assessments (e.g. miscue analysis, fluency assessments, retellings and comprehension questions) to assess reading ability. This approach is easier for

teachers to scaffold, gives candidates experience with readily usable classroom-based assessments, and promotes an understanding of the importance of targeted instruction. As in BEDUC 409, candidates develop specific lessons based on the assessments of their buddies.

A major example of change in our program is our new Secondary Certification Program, which has reflected an emphasis on student learning from its very inception. Candidates in this program focus on strategies for obtaining evidence of student learning in every interdisciplinary and discipline-based unit and lesson plan. An assignment in BEDUC 556: Adolescent Development includes close observation of student learning and an interview with an adolescent regarding his/her learning. The IMAGINE Camp is an interdisciplinary educational day camp in the summer for middle and high school students. Candidates in the Secondary Program design and teach the interdisciplinary curriculum, working toward assurance of the students' learning as well as the students' own self-assessments.

At this new Secondary Program level, students are required to use a format for planning lessons and units that breaks objectives into four categories (cognitive, academic, language, and socio/cultural) and their lesson and unit plans must include modifications/adjustments for meeting the diverse needs of students.

Standard V also requires that "students benefit from instruction that utilizes effective technologies and is designed to create technologically proficient learners," and toward this end, our program has dramatically increased its attention and expertise in this area. Faculty are focused on gaining greater expertise in technology, and this effort is resulting in greater skills among our candidates. As a result of several professors' taking a course in digital storytelling taught by one of our colleagues, this strategy has been implemented in more coursework for teacher candidates. In addition to the course dedicated specifically to technology (BEDUC 437), more courses include technology-based assignments such as Blackboard discussions (BEDUC 405 and 502), wiki development (BEDUC 566), webpages (BEDUC 437), use of software to support learning (BEDUC 421), child mentoring photo essays (BEDUC 402), integration of technology into lesson/unit planning (BEDUC 416), and electronic portfolios (BEDUC 425). In the Secondary Program, the final project in BEDUC 556, the software application review and methods portfolio in BEDUC 559, the electronic portfolio in BEDUC 563, and the Virtual Manipulative Reviews in BEDUC 566 are all technology-based assignments, many of which are new.

Standard 5.3: Knowledge of Learners and their Development in Social Contexts is also gaining strength and emphasis in our program. Responding to recommendations from alumni surveys and to those from the OSPI site visit report of February, 2004, the Education Program added a required course on special education, adding additional emphasis on the importance of assessing and attending to individual needs. BEDUC 491, Special Topics: Special Education, was required of all students in the fall of 2006. The current syllabus on this course explains a focus on the fourteen federally defined disability categories, on the demographic and functional

characteristics of children with various disabilities, and on the ways in which differences in children's cognitive, social, emotional, physical, neurological and sensory development affect their success in school. Students in the course also discuss procedures for referral, identification, and placement, as well as differentiation of instruction, legislation, support services, and the teacher's role and responsibilities.

Accommodation for special needs has become a focus in other courses as well. It is now required in all lesson plans developed in BEDUC 416 and utilized in field assignments. Differentiation of instruction is stressed in all KTA courses and is required reading in BEDUC 425 and 416. Candidates in BEDUC 417 gain an overview of FERPA as it relates to special education. In BEDUC 423, they study such physical conditions as asthma, allergies, and sensory or orthopedic challenges. Field instructors invite special educators to be guest speakers in their field seminars, and candidates gain everyday experience with these educators as they work with children in their classroom placements.

In a broader sense of special mental challenges, our program also now accommodates the English Language Learner, the struggling reader, and cultural differences which can cause difficulties for children in the general education classrooms. In this way, we aim to facilitate the success of **all** children in our schools.

In March, 2007, the program sponsored an evening lecture and half-day workshop for teachers, candidates, field instructors, and UWB faculty and staff, who came together to hear Guadalupe Valdes address the challenges of working with students who do not speak English as their first language. That year, the Supervisory Group of field instructors and faculty had held an ongoing book study of Ms. Valdes' book, *Con Respeto*.

The Worthington Multicultural Literature Database was launched in the autumn of 2007 at the Celebration of the 15th Anniversary of the Education Program. This resource, offering annotations of K-12 books with multicultural themes and accompanying lesson plans, continues to be compiled by candidates.

In accordance with Standard 5.4: Understanding of Teaching as a Profession, increased attention has recently been focused on candidates' dispositions. In BEDUC 406, candidates now read and become familiar with the NEA Code of Ethics; throughout the program, candidates have course readings on professionalism, they encounter moral dilemmas both in hypothetical and actual situations in coursework and fieldwork, and they engage in seminar discussions continually emphasizing the importance of ethical decisions and behavior. One of our field instructors, an expert in educational law, was recently invited to be a guest speaker in BEDUC 405, Contexts of Schooling, where she enumerated stories of child-centered legal issues.

In the new Secondary Program, candidates take classes together with practicing teachers who are enrolled in the Master of Education courses. Therefore, the candidates can now encounter issues of professionalism through direct interaction with these teachers.

Collaboration among colleagues has also improved, as connections between the academic and field-based components of our program have been strengthened by regularly scheduled

meetings between faculty and field instructors, faculty participation at PEAB and Teacher Certification meetings, and by faculty and staff visits to cooperating schools and school district offices. Faculty members have also made concentrated efforts to connect coursework to the field by integrating assignments requiring observations, interviews, and service learning, inviting teachers and administrators to speak in their classes, and offering curricular support for field instructors and master teachers.

## **FIELD EXPERIENCES**

Our program continues to evolve to meet requirements of Standard V in experiences provided to candidates in the field, although we feel that our field experiences are already very strong and student-focused.

Candidates are required to spend sixty hours of fieldwork before applying to our program, and then spend 400 hours (K-8) or 460 hours (Secondary) of fieldwork even before beginning their full ten-week quarter of student teaching, which includes at least six full weeks of solo teaching. During this time, they are carefully instructed in ways to connect to students, assess their learning, and plan subsequent instruction based on the results.

Field instructors in the K-8 Program are closely connected to faculty in many ways. All but one have been with the program for many years and have been included as guest speakers in courses, have participated in candidate interviews, in orientation sessions for new candidates, in Professional Development Days, in mock practice job interviews, and in student support groups – all duties being in addition to the myriad tasks involved in the observation of student teachers. One field instructor is also a member of the faculty, teaching courses for candidates. In the new Secondary Certification Program, each candidate is under the direct supervision of the university clinical faculty and a cooperating classroom teacher. Clinical faculty are former educators and content specialists who act as liaisons between the candidates, cooperating teachers, and the Education Program faculty. Therefore, these advisors on the “front line” are well acquainted with student performance, strategies to access and assess it, and ways to incorporate it into instruction.

As previously explained, two of our content courses are held on-site in a local elementary school, ensuring the connection as candidates work directly with students and return to their classroom to assess, reflect, and plan together. Other courses maintain direct connections to schools as well. In addition to those literacy courses mentioned previously (and which will be revisited within the Assessment section), courses on social studies, science, mathematics, technology, curriculum instruction and assessment, and adolescent development all require field assignments focusing on children’s unique learning needs and planning for their success.

Field seminars in both programs emphasize strategies to use information gained from student performance to inform resultant instruction. This is followed by direct observation of lessons, with additional counsel.

Field instructors recently developed a Dispositions assessment form, which is used three times during the year by master teachers/cooperating teachers as well, addressing the many crucial areas of professionalism such as attitudes and collegial behavior. Another example of collaboration is the recently organized School-University Collaborative – a partnership between UWB and our partner schools, and the annual Mentoring Workshops, establishing a cadre of collaborative master/cooperating teachers.

Candidates attend Professional Practice Seminars during all quarters (BEDUC 425 for K-8 and BEDUC 591 for secondary), connecting field work with theory and developing professional portfolios. Reflection on student learning is the key purpose of these seminars. One activity asks them to bring in packets of student work, and, using a Critical Friends Protocol, they examine each others' examples for evidence of student learning.

The final teacher candidate portfolio, a requirement for all interns, includes a section specifically dedicated to evidence of student learning, showing ways of collecting and analyzing student work, and using the information in plans for succeeding lessons. Candidates will have focused on this collection and will have saved many examples throughout their internship in preparation for this display. In our program, the content of portfolios has evolved over time, and will continue to include more student-based evidence, including a student voice component. Faculty will intentionally provide more assignments which will contribute to the final portfolio, focusing more specifically on Standard V criteria and showing more examples of student voice.

## **P-12 DISTRICT/SCHOOL PARTNERSHIPS**

PEAB members representing P-12 schools hold regular meetings on our campus, at which Standard V, along with other program elements, are regularly discussed. (See section on PEAB involvement in the section #2 concerning the *process* used to engage program personnel in reviewing, rethinking, and revising the program.)

Feedback is also regularly sought from current cooperating teachers and partner school principals through feedback forms used each quarter.

Our two K-8 literacy courses are taught on-site in one of the local elementary schools, providing a direct route for involvement.

A series of Professional Development Days are designed specifically as forums for candidates, master/cooperating teachers, field instructors/clinical faculty, and program faculty and staff to interact. Discussion circles during these workshops provide an opportunity for participants to reflect on the presentations and to share information and recommendations for the improvement of our program.

The purpose of our School-University Collaborative is to develop relationships between partner schools and the Education Program, in order for information to flow more freely in both

directions. Partner schools have clusters of candidates (six or more) and a Lead Master Teacher to serve as liaison with a UW Bothell field instructor.

## **FACULTY (AND STAFF) DEVELOPMENT**

Our Program Director, faculty member, and staff person have regularly attended WACTE meetings, have participated in discussions around Standard V, both in meetings and through the email conversations, thus staying up to date, and have reported the new trends and elements back to the rest of the faculty/staff.

Additional information/updates for faculty and staff have included reports from:

- Work sessions held by OSPI for the purpose of revising the standard, attended by Jean Eisele and Jon Howeler.
- Workshop on preparation for OSPI site visits, attended by Jean Eisele.
- The two-day Standard V retreat held at Sleeping Lady Resort in Leavenworth, attended by Jean Eisele and Professor Pam Joseph.

Dr. Jane VanGalen shared her expertise in technology by offering a course for faculty on Digital Storytelling. Several faculty members from our program as well as others attended, gaining valuable skill and a greater comfort level with technology, that has resulted in increased incorporation of technology in our own courses.

Professional Development Days, including the one highlighting Guadeloupe Valdez mentioned above, offer valuable information and networking opportunities for faculty, staff, master teachers, field supervisors/clinical faculty, and candidates alike. Other featured speakers/topics have included Sue Anderson (Mentoring), Jane Hanson (Literacy), Andrew Shouse (Science), and Amy Vujovich (Special Needs).

The K-8 Supervisory Group Colloquium – a forum of field instructors -- focused for two years (2006-8) on ways to ensure that our students had a positive impact on the learning of their own students. They met monthly to review videotaped examples of lessons, they joined seminars to show these videos and discuss them with our interns, and they focused many field seminars on this issue. Although this Colloquium is no longer in operation, all but one of our current field instructors were participants in this endeavor, and they continue to focus on Standard V criteria and ways they can help candidates implement them in the field.



2. *In no more than three pages, describe the process used to engage program personnel in reviewing, rethinking, and revising the program.*

In the two-year preparation for the OSPI site visit in January, 2009, many faculty meetings contributed time and effort into understanding the new standard and presenting evidence of our program's compliance. This concentrated focus naturally resulted in an increased program-wide awareness of the new paradigm and has informed all resultant conversation.

Representatives of our UWB program to WACTE in the year 2007-2008 were involved in and kept the faculty apprised of the development of the new Standard V, and, as each new quarter began, faculty began revising syllabi in accordance with the criteria. Two co-chairs were appointed to direct the preparation for the OSPI site visit in January, 2009. Dr. Carole Kubota—who would be in charge of Standards I through IV, and Dr. Jean Eisele—for Standard V, developed a timeline for the accumulation of necessary information and made continual requests to faculty and staff for reports, syllabi, data, and insights.

Program revisions based on Standard V have been regular items in faculty meetings in the past two years.

On May 22, 2008, Dr. Eisele led a workshop for faculty and staff whose charge was to design a new model for Teacher Education based on Standard V. Among other things, she presented the following:

- A comparison between the 1997 and 2007 Standard V elements, showing how the new standards were revisions of the old, moving from an instructional paradigm to a learning paradigm, from an emphasis on programs and candidates to one on the students.
- An examination of Standards 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, and 5.4, showing criteria and necessary teacher-based evidence and student-based evidence. She explained that, although our site visit would be based on the “old” standard criteria, she was urging us to pay close attention to these new criteria, so that the resulting program report could straddle the two and prepare the way for the total revision of our program.
- A chart showing alignment of Standard V with the WACs.
- A working chart for that day, showing criteria, what we needed for teacher-based evidence, and what we needed for student-based evidence.
- A Curriculum Integration and Instructional Alignment Guide, from OSPI, 2007, containing templates for unit and lesson plans, positive impact criteria charts for lessons, and a reference list.
- Charts of the various assessment tools, strategies, and resources that have been used in program evaluations over the preceding ten years.

Working with the three-column template of Standard V Criteria, Teacher-Based Evidence, and Student-Based Evidence, Dr. Eisele had revised it for the time being to read “Standard V Criteria,” “Where We Need to Look for Teacher-Based Evidence,” and “What We Need for Student-Based Evidence.” That day, faculty and staff began filling in the second column with things like their course assignments and the third with evidence from candidates' work with students.

Just prior to the beginning of the 2008-2009 school year, the entire afternoon of the fall faculty/staff day-long retreat in August, 2008 was concentrated on Standard V in relation to our program's Conceptual Framework. Following a large group review of the spirit and specific intent of the standard's criteria, faculty and staff worked in small groups to enumerate the ways

in which each one of their courses and/or staff duties were either in alignment or in need of revision in order to align more closely with the standard's criteria as well as with our Conceptual Framework. Dozens of newsprint charts were produced which formed a basis for our continued efforts.

Faculty meetings in the fall of 2008 each held updates on preparations, asking faculty to revisit and revise course syllabi to reflect the new criteria, to provide evidence of student work, to include additional assignments which involved technology.

Since the site visit in January, 2009, faculty have continued to work toward greater alignment with Standard V. In April, Jon Howeler reported on the OSPI Assessment Conference which focused largely on Standard V. He shared ideas from various programs with pilot grants, including using flip cameras with students to include student voice.

The April 8<sup>th</sup> faculty meeting also included an update and requests for further information to include in our report on planned Standard V revisions. Faculty proposed additional information in conjunction with student voice and positive impact on student learning; they reviewed and supplemented the draft prepared by Dr. Eisele, describing additional ways their work is becoming more closely aligned with the new standard.

In May, Jon Howeler reported on the Evidence-Based Pedagogy Assessment (EBPA), which will closely align with the new Standard V, and on the co-teaching model, an idea from St. Cloud State University being explored by many programs in our state. Our program will send representatives to the fall training sessions.

Teacher Certification meeting minutes also reveal attention paid to Standard V as early as November 29, 2007, when the changes were reported to be from a performance-based model to an evidence-based model, intended to show the impact on student learning by teacher candidates. Field instructors were informed that the PPA would be revised to reflect the new Standard V and that faculty would be working on program changes necessary to address changes to the standard. On January 25, 2008, this discussion was continued and handouts were distributed showing the shift from the earlier model to the newer one in all four criteria. Also distributed and discussed was a "Proposed Rollout Plan for the Implementation of Standard V" prepared by our Program Director, Cherry Banks, including our goal, things we will need, timeline and commitments, steps in the process, and questions. This document has been key in our revision process.

In the February 28<sup>th</sup> Teacher Certification meeting, the latest draft of the Teacher Candidate Disposition Form was submitted for discussion. This document was developed by the field instructors and is now used by master teachers and field instructors three times each year. It was also announced that some of the faculty and staff would be attending the OSPI Standard V Implementation Workshop on March 10.

During the meeting on May 14, 2008, Jean Eisele presented a report from a recent WACTE conference on the value of a candidate and a master teacher co-teaching during the time traditionally devoted to a candidate's solo teaching, which was mentioned earlier. The meeting on May 28<sup>th</sup>, 2008 included further discussion of the Standard V revisions, and copies of "Washington Classrooms: IN ACTION" were distributed. Faculty's adjustments to field assignments to reflect revised Standard V criteria were explained.

The following year, minutes reflected further attention to the new standard. Data collection tools for collecting evidence of student learning were developed and distributed in October. In December, a four-page chart showing our "System for Assessing Candidates' Progress Toward Certification, Including Field Experience and Coursework" was distributed.

The left-hand column included the Standard V Elements, and the other columns were headed “Assessment Type,” “When Assessment is Administered,” “Who Administers/Evaluates the Assessment,” and “Who Uses the Assessment Feedback.” This has been another important document guiding our revision process. The recommendations from the OSPI review team were discussed in February, and plans were developed for implementing them. Positive impact on student learning was once more on the agenda on March 17, 2009, as field instructors explored further possible forms of evidence, and good examples of this section of the Field Notebook were presented.

The Professional Education Advisory Board (PEAB) has also been kept abreast of changes in our program, and the program has benefited from its suggestions, making several adjustments and additions as a result of their input. (See letter from PEAB Board Chair Tim Parnell.) During the meeting of October 29, 2008, Dr. Kubota provided a comprehensive overview of the upcoming OSPI site review in January, 2009, which included discussion of all five standards. The new focus of Standard V was pointed out at that time, as well as the PEAB’s involvement in Standard I was explained. At the January 14<sup>th</sup> meeting, final preparations were discussed and program changes based on PEAB recommendations were reviewed. These included the course on special education, assessment strategies, professional collaboration, coordination of field and university components, improved program access and communication, and program growth.

Included in the March 25, 2009 meeting was a brief report on the site visit and actions being proposed to address the recommendations. There was also a lengthy discussion on ways to optimize the partnership between the PEAB and the UWB education program, including collegial conversations between the faculty and board over actual student work, which could inform in both directions. It was pointed out that Standard V will allow that to happen very easily. The June 3, 2009 meeting of the PEAB included a report on the revised Standard V, pointing out how the new standard had been addressed in the site review and ways the program will work to come more closely into alignment with the new criteria. Also included in that meeting was a lengthy description of the new Evidence-Based Pedagogy Assessment (EBPA), which will help this alignment.

As a result of efforts throughout these years described above, our candidates have been guided to focus more completely on their students’ growth. Their course assignments, lesson/unit plans, field observations, seminar discussions, and final portfolios reflect considerably increased attention to ways that they positively impact their students’ learning.

3. *In no more than two pages, describe the key strategies by which candidates will develop capacity to analyze and respond to student-based evidence. Please attach three samples of assignments or assessments that represent those strategies.*

Assessment of all types is paramount to the success of a teacher candidate's students. With this conviction, UWB weaves assessment strategies throughout our entire teacher certification programs, modeling and instructing. Candidates learn to assess their own learning, in peer- and self-evaluative exercises; they assess their students' learning in every lesson they teach; they assess the lesson itself for effectiveness in reaching all learners; and they assess resources, such as texts and websites.

One of the guiding questions of our program is "What did they learn? and How do you know?" Candidates are continually asked to provide proof of their students' learning. To show evidence of candidates' positive impact on student learning, they produce reading analyses, read-aloud reflections, science notebooks, and math evaluations, many of which are found in their final portfolio section, "Positive Impact on Student Learning." Throughout courses requiring lesson plans for use in classroom field placements, candidates explore strategies such as informal assessment articulated in written reflection, emergent literacy profile assessment, peer review, student performance on skill-based reading comprehension, and digital stories.

Many key strategies by which candidates analyze and respond to student-based evidence has already been explained earlier in this document in the "Course Content" section. The descriptions there of such courses as BEDUC 409 and 410, as well as the others, contain specific strategies used by students in this area.

Overall, coursework now includes greater emphasis on assessment, as also described previously in the section on Course Content. Specific examples of assessment strategies previously discussed include the Emergent Literacy Profile, the Qualitative Reading Inventory, and additional examples in various courses enumerated above. Three examples of candidate work are included in the Appendix.

In the K-8 program, assessment of special needs is addressed in BEDUC 491: Special Education, as candidates learn to identify disabilities, monitor progress, and use curriculum-based measurement for alternative assessments. They also look closely at one child with a disability and document innovative or creative interventions used by the classroom teacher. The format of all lessons and unit planning for the Secondary Program requires candidates to have and to assess student learning objectives in four categories (cognitive, academic, language, and socio-cultural).

Early in the program, K-8 candidates are taught to use a lesson plan format that specifies that assessment must be tightly aligned with objectives and includes both formative and summative assessments. The plan also asks for detailed description of the activities which will generate student-based evidence, modifications which will ensure every student's success, analysis of the evidence (the assessment section mentioned above), and also ways to provide feedback. In this way, they learn to anticipate points during each lesson when they might need to

provide instant adjustment, and to document the students' achievements and struggles. Candidates are also taught various methods of assessing student progress, appropriate for the various subject areas and various learning styles, so they can approach student learning individually. This lesson plan format will be revised to directly reflect new standards and to specify candidates' intentional inclusion of student voice.

In the Secondary Program, while not all using identical lesson plan formats, candidates are required to include the same components in all lessons and curriculum plans; different instructors have named them slightly differently and the components are in a different order. Since our candidates have a single instructor for their lesson and curriculum planning, the program is able to accommodate individual instructors and content area variations. However, we do have all the same information in lesson plans throughout the entire program.

The Instructional Design course also includes the development of an integrated curriculum unit which will be taught during the spring K-8 student teaching quarter. In this unit there is emphasis on collecting evidence of student learning, including the use of student voice.

Field-based assignments in content courses target candidates' attention on the myriad of elements that influence choices they make before, during, and after a lesson. They learn to distinguish between educative and miseducative choices as they work with students.

Faculty and field instructors will work with candidates to identify existing and develop new strategies, assignments, both in their courses and in the field. In addition, the program faculty and staff will work with cooperating teachers and principals in the communication of these new standards on ways to best meet the move from performance-based to student-based evidence.

Samples of assignments and assessments that represent the key strategies by which candidates develop capacity to analyze and respond to student-based evidence are included in the Appendix. They include an Emergent Literacy Professional Exemplar from BEDUC 409, a Final Paper from BEDUC 408, and an Analysis of Student Writing and Lesson from BEDUC 410.

*4. In no more than two pages, describe areas of your revised program that will be a focus of continuing attention and development as you proceed with implementation.*

With the imminent arrival of a permanent Program Director, our faculty and staff look forward eagerly to moving ahead with implementation of revisions to our program. For the past three years, interim directors have provided excellent support and guidance, but momentum can now increase.

Our fall, 2009 faculty/staff retreat will focus on Standard V, in addition to other topics that have been waiting in the wings, and we will develop an action plan for further program revisions. They will most likely include improvements in our candidates' field experiences germane to self-analysis, dispositions, and the gathering of evidence of student learning; we will increase our collective knowledge of technological advances and implications for our teaching and our candidates' teaching; we will explore additional ways to collaborate with school personnel for mutual benefit.

We are proud, however, of the advances we have been able to make in this standard under the leadership of our interim directors. Many of our plans have already been described, such as the continually increased inclusion of Standard V criteria in course syllabi and the strengthening of the candidates' portfolio section for evidence of student learning.

We continue to explore ways to increase the effectiveness of candidates' field experiences. One thing we are currently exploring is a way to allow K-8 candidates to experience their students' lives on the three days per week during the winter quarter when they are taking courses on campus. This is something which has been continually requested by master teachers, field instructors, and candidates themselves. Two years ago, we instituted a full week in the field for candidates in the K-8 program during their winter quarter, coupling it with a full week of instruction the following week. Finding the five days of coursework to be too concentrated, we retained the full week in the field the next year but did not include the full week of courses. This, too, was unacceptable, due to missed course time in a quarter that was already handicapped by many Monday holidays. This past year we returned to our previous practice but continue to explore ways to enable candidates to experience a classroom's life in a full week, looking at possibilities of utilizing exam week or September Experience.

Another proposal involves the utilization of Facebook, linked to the UWB page. This is being considered as a vehicle through which to explore additional examples of student learning, of collaborative practice, and of community involvement.

We also continue to develop course/field assignments which will deepen candidates' impact on student learning through curriculum, pedagogy, partnerships with parents and community, and professional responsibilities. Professional portfolios can be improved by a greater specificity within the section on Impact on Student Learning. Where some portfolios merely include examples of student work, emphasis will be strengthened on the explanation of implications of this work and comparative examples offering evidence that the candidate's teaching has affected this learning.

One proposed activity will enable candidates to watch a video of a lesson and analyze it for demonstrations of student-based evidence. Related to this, the assignment in BEDUC 425, which asks that candidates compare their own videotaped lessons from fall and from spring, can focus more directly on visible evidence of student learning. Another idea is to team candidates from the K-8 and the Secondary program in a collaborative exercise examining student work. Another suggestion involves the flip-cams mentioned earlier, which will provide immediate self-analysis of a candidate's performance.

And we are eager to explore the possibilities inherent in co-teaching situations during the student teaching quarter.

***5. Please attach a letter from the PEAB chair that describes the PEAB's involvement in reviewing and revising the program.***

A signed copy of this letter, from Tim Parnell, Principal of Hazelwood Elementary School in Lynnwood, Washington, and Chairman of our Professional Education Advisory Board, can be found in an additional attachment to this email. Although the spacing does not transfer easily from the scanned version, the text is presented below.

June 29, 2009

To Whom It May Concern:

The Professional Education Advisory Board (PEAB) for the Education Program at the University of Washington, Bothell (UW Bothell) is an active and engaged group working on continual improvement since the inception of the school. I served as chair of this group in 2008-2009. Our group consisted of program graduates, school administrators and teachers, and UW Bothell faculty and staff. We held quarterly meetings this past year with additional meetings related to the OSPI audit and other UW Bothell events. During this year, the UW Bothell faculty informed the PEAB of the new Standard V requirements, shifting the focus from program description and intern learning to student learning. We participated in the OSPI site visit and helped revise the program to align with the new Standard V regulations, asking for concrete evidence of student learning and documentation about the impact of interns' teaching on student learning. The purpose of this letter is to summarize the input of the PEAB.

The following program changes were made based on the 2004 OSPI Review, PEAB recommendations, follow-up studies, placement data, exit interviews, candidate quarterly surveys, field instructors' input, and faculty and staff recommendation.

- The 2004 OSPI review, PEAB recommendations, and Cohort Four's Exit Interview from June, 2004 led to the 2005-06 Education Program's addition of a special education course required by all K-8 Teacher Certification candidates in the Secondary Certification Program.

- Cohort Five students suggested "field work in middle schools" for our program. Similarly, the 2004 OSPI review and PEAB recommended that the Education Program facilitate candidates' ability to teach at the middle levels (grades 6-8). For candidates in the K-8 Teacher Certification Program, we added endorsements in middle school science/mathematics and in humanities/social studies in 2006 and literacy in 2007. We also placed more K-8 candidates in 6<sup>th</sup>-8<sup>th</sup> grade classrooms for dyad placements during autumn quarter. Also, in response to these recommendations and to district needs, the Secondary Certification Program offering endorsements in Biology, Mathematics and English/Language Arts was initiated in the fall of 2007. In the fall of 2008, the Secondary Teacher Certification program was expanded to include candidates pursuing certification in history and social studies.
- In response to the 2004 OSPI review and PEAB recommendation to advocate for salary equity for program faculty, Education Program faculty and staff salaries were adjusted for merit and salary compressions, but continued advocacy is required.
- The 2004 OSPI review and PEAB recommendations called for the development of a systematic plan for minority recruitment and the formalization of a policy regarding more diverse student teaching placements. The UW Bothell partnership agreements with community colleges, internal recruitment through the Education Minor led to the addition of Freshmen and Sophomores (many of them first generation students of color) to the UW Bothell campus, and increased promotion of the Education Program resulted in moderate increases in underrepresented groups applying for admission to the Teacher Certification Program.
- In response to the 2004 OSPI review and PEAB recommendation recognizing the need for teacher education candidates to more effectively verbalize assessment strategies and procedures, instructors incorporated more assessment components within methods courses. More attention was given to explicit articulation the processes involved in developing standards-bases assessments and what constitutes evidence of student learning. Interns demonstrated (in their portfolios) clear examples of ways in which they monitor the on-going process of student learning and positively impact student learning including summary data, work samples, and rubrics. Field instructors also included assessment in their reflective seminar session held in the field. Instructing and mentoring candidates in assessment was a major topic within the Supervisory Group.
- The 2005 PEAB recommended to administrators, teachers, and UW Bothell faculty the creation of a professional context for the exchange of ideas and collaboration on education issues. In response, the Education Program hosted the following events designed to promote professional collaboration and community: the Teacher Certification Program Mentoring Workshop (10/20/2004), Commemoration of Brown v. Board of Education (11/27/2005), Book Reception and Lecture: Professor Cherry A. McGee Banks (2/27/2005), Visiting Scholar Lecture: Jane Rolland Martin (3/20/2005), Visiting Scholar Lecture: William Ayers (6/8/2005).
- The PEAB also recommended an increased coordination of field and university components of the Teacher Education Program. In the fall of 2005, Dr. Nancy Place began teaching the two-quarter literacy course at Juanita Elementary which dedicated an empty classroom for UW Bothell use. Throughout the two quarters, each candidate was paired with an elementary school "buddy." For the first part of each session, candidates worked with the professor and tested new ideas to which they've been introduced with their literacy buddies. Candidates gathered again with the professor to debrief their experiences and discuss the lessons learned from working with the students. We



continued this arrangement and it has worked extremely well and was much appreciated by the candidates.

- As early as 2001, students from Extended Cohort One suggested that interns be able to see an entire week in their field placements prior to the spring internship, and minutes of faculty (9.20.04, 7.08.05, 5.9.06) and teacher certification (5.26.04) meetings reflected ongoing discussion about this possibility. In response to the additional PEAB recommendation to increase coordination of field and university components of the Teacher Education Program, beginning in winter of 2006, candidates began spending a full week at their field sites. In past years, candidates would be in their field sites only two days a week during winter quarter. Field Instructors and Master Teachers also felt that it would be beneficial for the candidates to experience a full week in the field prior to their full-time teaching quarter in the spring.
- In response to the PEAB recommendation to increase coordination of field and university components of the Teacher Education Program, Field Instructors collaborated with faculty and assumed greater instructional responsibility in many ways. They participated in candidate interviews and mock interviews, provided instruction in courses such as panel discussions, evaluating lesson plans, and leading classes on classroom management.
- The PEAB recommended improved program descriptions and access. In 2005 the Education Program hired an office assistant who was assigned the task of redesigning and monitoring the Education Program's website to more effectively promote the program and publicize program activities. The website continues to evolve as more programs are added.

- The PEAB recommended a more effective means of communicating with program completers and alumni. The "Reflections" Education Program Newsletter was initiated in 2006. The Newsletter included notes and features on program graduates, updates on program special events, activities, and offerings, and notes and features on faculty and staff. The Newsletters were available on-line at the Education Program website.

- At the suggestion of the PEAB, a Teacher Certification candidate was added as a voting member of the PEAB beginning in the *2005/06* academic year. We continue to have candidate representation on the PEAB.

The UW Bothell PEAB helped improve the Education Program and we look forward to our continuing partnership with the dynamic UW Bothell faculty and staff to make our programs the best in the region, preparing educators to better serve the youth of our communities. If you have other questions and/or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me at: (425) 431-7885 and/or [pamellt@edmonds.wednet.edu](mailto:pamellt@edmonds.wednet.edu).

**Sincerely,**

**Timothy A. Parnell, Ed. D.**